

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Regular Meeting

August 8, 1968
10:00 A.M.

Council Chamber, City Hall

The meeting was called to order with Mayor Akin presiding.

Roll Call:

Present: Councilmen Long, Nichols, Mayor Akin, Councilman Janes
Absent: Councilman LaRue

Present also: R. M. Tinstman, City Manager; Doren R. Eskew
City Attorney

Councilman LaRue absent as he was out of the City.

Mayor Akin welcomed all citizens present.

Invocation was delivered by DR. WM. E. DENHAM, JR., First Baptist Church.

Fair Housing Ordinance

MAYOR AKIN noted the first item on the Agenda was consideration of the Fair Housing Ordinance. COUNCILMAN NICHOLS explained the Charter was clear in delineating an alternate as to a course of action for the Council, and the Council is compelled to either rescind the Ordinance now in suspense or send it to a vote of the people. The Human Relations Commission had held public hearings on the ordinance and there had been some suggested amendments made to the Ordinance to improve procedural matters. Councilman Nichols also said that should Ordinance No. 680517-A be submitted to the people and approved, it could not be amended for two years; and because human rights are involved, he thought an ordinance which could not be amended for two years deserved very close study.

In discussion, COUNCILMAN LONG wanted to make a statement that under the Charter there was one of two alternatives: (1) to repeal the Ordinance that was passed; or (2) to submit it to a vote of the people, and she said she felt compelled to send this Ordinance to the vote of the people.

MAYOR AKIN said he was aware upon certification of the petition to the Council that the citizens had won a right to vote. The Human Relations Commission did request a series of hearings with a great deal of community and citizen interest expressed; and since there resulted from these hearings and studies some amendments which the Commission recommends to be incorporated into a new Ordinance, there is no other way that this could be accomplished without removing the Ordinance on which there is a request for referendum. He concurred

with Councilman Nichols' interpretation that the referred Ordinance, if adopted, could not be amended for two years, stating this type of inflexibility is something that denies progress. Therefore, in the interest of taking the first step from his point of view, toward the adoption of another Ordinance, he would vote for rescinding the present Ordinance (No. 680517-A) and support an amended ordinance to be submitted to the vote of the people.

COUNCILMAN LONG noted that although there were hearings held by the Commission she did not think that the hearings represented the 25,000 people that petitioned the Council for referendum. If the Ordinance is repealed and another drawn up and presented to the voters, it would not be the same as the referendum that the Council is compelled to do by Charter. Her stand was the Ordinance should either be repealed or sent to the vote of the people.

COUNCILMAN NICHOLS stated his position on any City Ordinance would be determined by the action of the voters. If they approve the Ordinance he said he would vote to enact the Ordinance immediately. Should they vote against an Ordinance, then he would never vote for the Ordinance. In discussion, Mayor Akin brought out the point that if the new Ordinance is put to the vote of the people, the results of that vote would not be binding either on the Council or the public; but as indicated by Councilman Nichols, he would go along with his philosophy that if this were the will of a majority of the people, at that time he would vote to enact the Ordinance as the voters had indicated. It would be binding and would require being reinforced by formal passage of an Ordinance.

There being no further discussion, Mayor Akin introduced the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE REPEALING ORDINANCE NO. 680517-A, AND
DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman Nichols moved the ordinance be passed through its first reading. Councilman Janes, stating since he was not in favor of the original ordinance, seconded the motion which carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Akin, Councilmen Janes, Nichols
Noes: * Councilman Long
Absent: Councilman LaRue

* Councilman Long voting against the repeal for reasons stated above.

Complaint on Water and Light Disconnection

MR. CHESTER MORRIS appeared before the Council stating his water and lights had been disconnected. The City Manager reported the water had been turned on, and invited Mr. Morris to get in touch with his office. Councilman Nichols told Mr. Morris to confer with MR. MIKE BROWN in the City Manager's Office and work this matter out.

Hearing on Preliminary Plans on University East Renewal Project

MAYOR AKIN opened the hearing on University East Project Plan to the public, and an opportunity was accorded to all persons and organizations attending to present their views.

MR. LEON LURIE, Executive Director, Urban Renewal Agency, distributed copies of the Urban Renewal Plan for University East and of a Relocation Information Document. He recognized the firms and engineers who did the work on these plans--BROOKS, BARR, GRAEBER & WHITE, Architects; and CARTER BURGESS ENGINEERS, Engineers from Fort Worth.

MAYOR AKIN recognized former Mayor LESTER PALMER, University of Texas.

MR. LURIE displayed maps showing the various Urban Renewal projects in the community--KEALING PROJECT and the GLEN OAKS PROJECT, now well under way; the BLACKSHEAR PROJECT, in the planning phase at this time; the BRACKENRIDGE PROJECT, (adjacent and to the south of the University East Project) awaiting final approval from the Washington Office, the University Area under discussion today; and the GLEN OAKS NO 2 AREA, now in the Regional Urban Renewal Office for review.

MR. LURIE outlined the specific boundaries, summarizing them generally as E. 19th Street, Comal Street, Warrenburger, and Red River Street. Red River Street will remain open in the plan, but right of way is being acquired for Warrenburger, Swisher, Manor Road, Comal, East 19th Street and I.H. 35. All of the interior streets are to be closed internally within the streets just mentioned. There are approximately 10.3 acres which are not being acquired by the Agency--the land north of Manor Road up to Warrenburger, which the University is acquiring. The balance of the land between Manor Road, south to 19th Street and from Red River over to Comal is the area which the Urban Renewal Agency will be dealing with each property owner in this project for acquisition of the land, to convey under an agreement with the University of Texas and the Highway Department for the expansion of the main university complexes as well as the expansion of the freeway.

Maps were presented showing the boundaries of University East, and pin-pointing the standard structures, those that could be rehabilitated, and those that were substandard; the street systems and proposed street widening; commercial areas, residential areas, and public use areas; water and sanitary sewer lines through the area and proposed storm sewer drainage system. Each map was reviewed in detail. Slides were projected showing the deficiencies in the entire area as well as some of the excellent structures. He pointed out this area would not be used as a relocation resource. The thoroughfare plan conforms to the Transportation Plan of the City as well as to the State Highway Plan. Major land reuse in this area is devoted to public reuse--99.8 acres, 67 of which will go to the University of Texas, and 32.7 in streets.

Mr. Lurie reviewed the Relocation Data in detail, stating 85% of the displacees were students. Total displacees will be 1621. He stated very few families and individuals are qualified for public housing, and listed the relocation possibilities particularly for the students. The housing resource problem in the University East relocation, with higher incomes and with the new housing bill passed August 1st, provide a number of things not available in the past. He pointed out the advantages and resources which had not been opened until now. New dormitories, university properties, plus the units and apartments under construction in the rest of the Austin area, are available. Ample units under the new Federally aided program will be available.

With the overall need including the Glen Oaks Project and the Brackenridge Project, there is an availability far exceeding the requirements for all categories for displacees through any type of governmental action. Mr. Lurie reported these charts under review had been acceptable in all respects through the various Federal Departments.

Also of importance are the businesses to be relocated. Mr. Lurie reported the required square footage which these businesses will need to relocate is available in commercial land presently zoned for each category. There are 6 million square feet of land area available and the total requirements are 1 1/2 million square feet.

Mr. Lurie discussed the various types of relocation payments, emphasizing the Urban Renewal Agency would handle each problem on an individual basis. There are various relocation payments, moving payments, relocation adjustment payments available to the families and individuals in the area. Settlement costs will be paid at the time the property is closed for recording fees, releases of liens, etc., so that there will be no expense to the seller. There are a number of different types of payments which can be made directly to the business man, for moving, storage, and settlement costs.

COUNCILMAN LONG asked about the timing of notifying people to move. Mr. Lurie outlined the various steps, stating the University East Plans would be submitted by October or before, and the Project will begin acquisition no later than December, 1968. Three or four months later, they actually would be purchasing property in the area. The estimated completion date of University East is December, 1972. Some individuals have already requested the purchase of their property, and he invited any other persons who would like early purchases to contact the Agency. The acquisition cycle is south of 19th to the immediate west of the Freeway, and then east of the Freeway. Councilman Long asked when the University would be requiring the people to move. Mr. Lurie said in this Project, the Urban Renewal would assist the various ones to move. Councilman Long reported an individual case of two ladies, one 99 years old, and the other 84 years, and they were not eager to move. She asked if it were likely that an area is not going to be used for several years, if they could remain there. Mr. Lurie stated they would allow anyone to stay in the area as long as possible; and in situations like this, they would work around that particular property for a long period of time before any action was taken. He asked for a copy of the letter for his files.

The hearing was opened to the public. MRS. GILES HARRIS inquired about the timing of the Kealing Project. Mr. Lurie stated it was in the completion state now. MR. S. H. SCHWARTZ was interested in the business areas and questioned the selection of the slides in that some pictures had been omitted. MR. HOMER STARK stated the pictures were misleading. Mr. Lurie discussed briefly the commercial possibilities; and as to the slides, he said the slides were selected at random to give an overall view of the entire area. In answer to Mr. Dobie's question, he said no one had been informed that improvements made now would not be paid for; in fact improvements had been made in the area, and that value will be included in the appraisal when made. Mr. Dobie was interested in zoning of areas under Urban Renewal. Mr. Lurie was not familiar with the circumstances involved in this particular instance, but stated the zoning Committee had heard requests for zoning in the area; and until such time as a public hearing is held, he believed it was conceded that all this would proceed as usual. MRS. BROWN, Comal Street, asked if the upkeep of her place would affect the value. Mr. Lurie assumed property that was maintained would retain its value in comparison with those that had not been kept up. He explained a definite answer would be on an individual basis, as each piece of property was handled through appraisals and zoning, and that value would be paid for what is there, based on a market value approach. He also pointed out that houses could be moved to other locations.

MR. RALPH WEINER supposed property would be appraised at its present use; and if resold at a different use, there would be a difference in the appraisal.

MR. LINEBACK was interested in the property north of Manor Road, and MRS. FELL was interested in the right of way purchases on I.H. 35. Mr. Lurie explained that although the University was acquiring the property north of Manor Road, the Urban Renewal Agency had the responsibility of assisting those individuals in that area as well as those in the area to the immediate south in relocation. On the right of way purchases, the Urban Renewal Agency would deal individually with each of the owners and each would be entitled to all the provisions with everyone else in this particular area. MR. LINEBACK was in the area the University would purchase, and was told the same principles applied--the Urban Renewal Agency had the responsibility of relocation. Probably on the right of way purchase it will be nearly two years before this is undertaken, although this was subject to change.

MR. FRED SCOTT on Whittier Street said he had 500 signatures against Urban Renewal and asked what could be done to stop it. Mr. Lurie reported Urban Renewal was only assisting in this particular area, and this petition would not alleviate the situation, as land is being taken for University expansion under Legislative authorization. The City Attorney explained the legal aspects and the difference in Mr. Scott's petition and the Referendum Petition.

MR. CLYDE LITTLEFIELD stated this was the second time he had his property condemned. He said Urban Renewal is fair, and the owners will get what their property is worth. MRS. HIGGINS, 1912 Comal, stated the amount of money they would receive for their property would not take care of a down payment on another home, and they would be in debt for the rest of their lives. Mr. Lurie explained fair market value would be paid for the property; and he reiterated that Congress had provided an additional amount up to \$5,000 as a relocation payment. He believed Mrs. Higgins would admit that if she had an extra amount of cash in addition to the value of her property, she could find another house in the community without much problem. In answer to Mr. Schwartz's statement, Mr. Lurie replied there had never been a profit made on any Urban Renewal land in the United States; there will be a loss incurred. MR. RAMSEY asked if the boundaries were so defined that there could be no adjustments in any manner. Mr. Lurie replied that was correct. MR. FRED EBY said the University took 38 units from him; and when he tried to invest that money, he could not get equal value. Urban Renewal is going too fast, and too many people are trying to find a home at a reasonable and fair price. The price of homes is going up and are above the fair market value. Mr. Higgins was told he could repurchase his home.

MR. G. L. MORRISON, 1907 Longfellow, pointed out the situation of people who owned their homes, and having to sell them and go back in debt at an income of only Social Security, and stated these things should be taken into account.

MAYOR AKIN said the Council was trying to see that a fair decision is made; that they did take a bus tour of the area, but this was only for a review. Most of the Council members have been in Austin for a long time, and were familiar with the neighborhood. He stated Mr. Lurie and the Urban Renewal people are fair, and he urged that the citizens not prejudge the Agency in the manner in which it is going to approach the property owners and to try to place a fair value on their properties.

MR. OLIN HAGER asked if the Council could stop this now if it wanted to. Mr. Lurie explained under the State Urban Renewal Law, there must be held a public hearing on each project. The University is going to expand into this area irrespective of Urban Renewal. All Urban Renewal is trying to do is to present all the information possible, what has been put together for the plans, and to work with the University officials and try to reach some agreeable situation, representing the City of Austin, in line with the needs of the University

expansion. MR. KRUEGER inquired about the \$5,000 extra, and Mr. Lurie explained this amount depended on each particular need UP to \$5,000 in addition to what each property owner was paid for their property. Councilman Long explained the University could not help the people in their relocation programs but the Urban Renewal could.

The City Manager pointed out property owners, particularly on central express routes, come in for early acquisition, and the City had tried to help them to the point of borrowing money to buy properties in the path of these expressways on the early acquisitions or hardship cases. Mr. Lurie said if everyone waited until the last few days of acquisition, there would not be sufficient help for them, and there must be orderly purchasing.

MR. JOE HART, represented MRS. ROY BEDICHECK whose property was north of Manor Road. Mr. Lurie advised Mr. Hart that he should contact the University in behalf of his client, dealing with the University concerning money and time factors; however, the Urban Renewal will be assisting Mrs. Bedicheck from a relocation standpoint.

MRS. BROWN who is in the process of being relocated after her house is sold and unaware of the difference of the payment she will get and what she will have to make, was told Urban Renewal would deal with the individuals, and take care of the legal matters at no expense or no inconvenience to the individual. Mr. P. Lewis complained on lack of information on appraisals. Mr. Stanley Brinkly stated this \$5,000 additional would just about absorb the difference on an average sale of a home and purchase of another. REV. M. C. ARNOLD, 19th Street Baptist Church was interested to know if 19th Street east of Comal was to be widened, and the answer was it was not at this time. MR. LURIE explained to MR. BRYANT the payment of UP to \$5,000, how it was applied in the various cases.

Former Mayor PALMER, University of Texas, congratulated the Council on this hearing. It is the individual's problems and his rights that Urban Renewal is trying to protect in public interest. He pointed out with the terrific growth of the University, as well as that of the City, that some people would suffer disruption. He announced when he was on the Council he disqualified himself on taking any part in this University East Project as his family home is in the area. He expressed appreciation that the Council had taken the time to hear everybody express their opinions and problems.

MAYOR AKIN thanked everyone who came, stating the Council was interested in their further comment.

Councilman Long moved the hearing be closed. The motion, seconded by Councilman Nichols, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilman Nichols, Mayor Akin, Councilmen Janes, Long
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman LaRue

After discussion, Councilman Long offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, APPROVING THE
URBAN RENEWAL PLAN AND THE FEASIBILITY
OF RELOCATION FOR PROJECT NO. TEXAS R-103

WHEREAS, under the provisions of Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to provide financial assistance to Local Public Agencies for undertaking and carrying out urban renewal projects; and,

WHEREAS, it is provided in such act that contracts for financial aid thereunder shall require that the Urban Renewal Plan for the respective project area be approved by the Governing Body of the locality in which the project is situated and that such approval include findings by the Governing Body that: (1) The financial aid to be provided in the contract is necessary to enable the project to be undertaken in accordance with the Urban Renewal Plan; (2) The Urban Renewal Plan will afford maximum opportunity, consistent with the sound needs of the locality as a whole, for the rehabilitation or redevelopment of the urban renewal area by private enterprise; (3) The Urban Renewal Plan conforms to the general plan for the development of the locality as a whole; and (4) The Urban Renewal Plan gives due consideration to the provision of adequate park and recreational area and facilities, as may be desirable for neighborhood improvement, with special consideration for the health, safety, and welfare of children residing in the general vicinity of the site covered by the Plan; and,

WHEREAS, the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Austin, herein called the "Local Public Agency", has entered into a planning contract for financial assistance under such Act with the United States of America, acting by and through the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, pursuant to which federal funds were provided for the Urban Renewal Project, hereinafter called the "Project", identified as University East Project, Tex R-103, and encompassing the area in the City of Austin, Texas, described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes; and,

WHEREAS, the University of Texas at Austin is located within and adjacent to the Project Area; and,

WHEREAS, the Local Public Agency has applied for additional financial assistance under such Act and proposes to enter into an additional contract or contracts with the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the undertaking of, and for making available additional financial assistance for, the Project; and,

WHEREAS, the Local Public Agency has made detailed studies of the location, physical condition of structures, land use, environmental influences, and social, cultural, and economic conditions of the Project area and has determined

that the area is a slum or blighted area and that it is detrimental and a menace to the safety, health, and welfare of the inhabitants and users thereof and of the locality at large, because of the existence of dilapidated structures, inadequate and poorly laid out streets, mixed land uses and inadequate recreational facilities, and the members of this Governing Body have been fully apprised by the Local Public Agency and are aware of these facts and conditions; and,

WHEREAS, there has been prepared and referred to the City Council of the City of Austin for review and approval, an Urban Renewal Plan for the project area dated May 10, 1968, consisting of 7 pages, one exhibit of 2 pages and 3 pages of maps, supported by a resolution of the Local Public Agency approving said plan and recommending same to this Governing Body; and,

WHEREAS, a general plan has been prepared and is recognized and used as a guide for the general development of the locality as a whole; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission of the City of Austin has considered said Urban Renewal Plan as required by law and has submitted to this Governing Body its report and recommendations respecting Urban Renewal Plan for the Project Area and has certified that the Urban Renewal Plan conforms to the general plan for the Locality as a whole, and this Governing Body has duly considered the report, recommendations and certification of the Planning Commission; and,

WHEREAS, said Urban Renewal Plan for the project area prescribes certain land uses for the project area and will require, among other things, changes, in zoning, the vacating and removal of streets, alleys and other public ways, the establishment of new street patterns, the location and relocation of sewer and water mains and other public facilities; and,

WHEREAS, the Local Public Agency has prepared and submitted a program for the relocation of individuals and families that may be displaced as a result of carrying out the Project in accordance with said Urban Renewal Plan; and,

WHEREAS, there has also been presented to the Governing Body information and data respecting the relocation program which has been prepared by the Local Public Agency as a result of studies, surveys, and inspections in the Project Area and the assembling and analysis of the data and information obtained from such studies, surveys, and inspections; and,

WHEREAS, the members of the Governing Body have general knowledge of the conditions prevailing in the Project area and of the availability of proper housing in the Locality for the relocation of individuals and families that may be displaced from the Project area and, in the light of such knowledge of local housing conditions, have carefully considered and reviewed such proposals for relocation; and,

WHEREAS, on this, the 8th day of August, 1968, this Governing Body held a public hearing in accordance with the applicable law wherein the citizens of this locality were invited to and did discuss and make recommendations regarding such Urban Renewal Plan for the Project area; and,

WHEREAS, it is necessary that the Governing Body take appropriate official action respecting the relocation program and said Urban Renewal Plan for the Project, in conformity with the contract for financial assistance between the Local Public Agency and the United States of America, acting by and through the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and,

WHEREAS, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance and Executive Order 11063 prohibits discrimination on basis of race, color, creed or national origin in sale, lease or other disposition of residential property (including land intended for residential use) or in the use or occupancy thereof; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

1. That it is hereby found and determined that the Project is a slum and blighted area and qualifies as an eligible project area under Article 12691-3 of the Revised Civil Statutes of Texas.

2. That said Urban Renewal Plan for the Project aforementioned, having been duly reviewed and considered, is hereby approved, and the City Clerk is hereby directed to file said copy of the Urban Renewal Plan with the minutes of this meeting.

3. That it is hereby found and determined that the objectives of the Urban Renewal Plan cannot be achieved through rehabilitation of the Project Area.

4. That it is hereby found and determined that said Urban Renewal Plan for the Project Area conforms to the general plan of the Locality.

5. That it is hereby found and determined that the financial aid provided and to be provided pursuant to the contracts for Federal financial assistance pertaining to the Project is necessary to enable the project to be undertaken in accordance with the Urban Renewal Plan for the Project Area.

6. That it is hereby found and determined that the undertaking of the Project will promote the public welfare and proper development of the community (a) by making land in the Project Area available for disposition, for uses in accordance with the Urban Renewal Plan, to the University of Texas; and (b) by providing, through the redevelopment of the area in accordance with the Urban Renewal Plan, a cohesive neighborhood environment compatible with the functions and needs of such educational institution.

7. That it is hereby found and determined that the above mentioned Urban Renewal Plan for the Urban Renewal Area will afford maximum opportunity, consistent with the sound needs of the Locality as a whole, for the urban renewal of such Area by private enterprise.

8. That it is hereby found and determined that the program for the proper relocation of individuals and families displaced in carrying out the Project in decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings in conformity with acceptable standards is feasible and can be reasonably and timely effected to permit the proper prosecution and completion of the Project; and that such dwellings or dwelling units available or to be made available to such displaced individuals and families are at least equal in number to the number of displaced individuals and families, are not generally less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities than the dwellings of the displaced individuals and families in the Project Area, are available at rents or prices within the financial means of the displaced individuals and families, and are reasonably accessible to their places of employment.

9. That in order to implement and facilitate the effectuation of the Urban Renewal Plan hereby approved, it is found and determined that certain official action must be taken by this Body with reference, among other things, to changes in zoning, the vacating and removal of streets, alleys, and other public ways, the establishment of new street patterns, the location and relocation of sewer and water mains and other public facilities, and, accordingly, this Body hereby (a) pledges its cooperation in helping to carry out such Urban Renewal Plan; (b) requests the various officials, departments, boards, and agencies of the City of Austin having administrative responsibilities in the premises likewise to cooperate to such end and to exercise their respective functions and powers in a manner consistent with said Urban Renewal Plan; and (c) stands ready to consider and take appropriate action upon proposals and measures designed to effectuate said Urban Renewal Plan.

10. That additional financial assistance under the provisions of Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is necessary to enable the land in the Project Area to be renewed in accordance with the Urban Renewal Plan for the Project Area, and, accordingly, the filing by the Local Public Agency of an application or applications for such financial assistance under said Title I is hereby approved.

11. That the United States of America and the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development be, and they are hereby, assured of full compliance by the Local Public Agency and this Governing Body with regulations of the Department of Housing and Urban Development effectuating Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and applicable Executive Orders.

Project No. Tex. R-103
Contract No. Tex. R-103(A)
Austin, Texas

EXHIBIT A

BEGINNING at the intersection of the West right-of-way line of Red River Street with the North right-of-way line of East 19th Street, said point of beginning being in the North line of the Brackenridge Urban Renewal Area;

THENCE, with said North right-of-way line of East 19th Street, Easterly to its point of intersection with the West right-of-way line of East Avenue;

THENCE, Southeasterly to the point of intersection of the South right-of-way line of East 19th Street and the East right-of-way line of East Avenue;

THENCE, with said South right-of-way line of East 19th Street, Easterly to its point of intersection with the East right-of-way line of Comal Street;

THENCE, with said East right-of-way line of Comal Street, Northerly to its point of intersection with the North right-of-way line of Manor Road;

THENCE, with said North right-of-way line of Manor Road, Southwesterly to its point of intersection with the East right-of-way line of East Avenue;

THENCE, westerly to the point of intersection of the west right of way line of East Avenue and the north right of way line of Manor Road;

THENCE, northeasterly with the west right of way line of East Avenue to its intersection with the south right of way line of East 23rd Street;

THENCE, with said south right of way line of East 23rd Street westerly to its point of intersection with the east right of way line of the alley east of Swisher Street;

THENCE, with said east right of way line of the alley east of Swisher Street, southerly 94.5' to a point on the said east right of way line of the alley east of Swisher Street;

THENCE, from said point on the east right of way line of the alley east of Swisher, westerly to a point in the east right of way line of Swisher;

THENCE, from said point on the east right of way line of Swisher, northerly on the east right of way line of Swisher to its point of intersection with the north right of way line of Wahrenberger;

THENCE, westerly with said north right of way line of Wahrenberger Street and its prolongation, same being the south property line of Medical Arts Square Subdivision, a subdivision of record in plat book 32 at page 1292 of the Plat Records of Travis County, Texas, to a point in the east right of way line of Red River Street, the same being the southwest corner of the Medical Arts Square Subdivision;

THENCE, continuing westerly with the prolongation of the north right of way line of Wahrenberger Street to a point in the west right of way line of Red River Street;

THENCE, with said west right of way line of Red River southerly to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

SAVE AND EXCEPT the two tracts hereinafter specifically described as follows:

TRACT NO. ONE:

BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the east right of way line of Red River Street and the north right of way line of Manor Road;

THENCE, easterly with the north right of way line of Manor Road to its point of intersection with the west right of way line of Oldham Street;

THENCE, northerly with the west right of way line of Oldham Street to its point of intersection with the north right of way line of East 23rd Street;

THENCE, easterly with the north right of way line of East 23rd Street to its point of intersection with the west right of way line of Swisher Street;

THENCE, northerly with the west right of way line of Swisher Street to its point of intersection with the south right of way line of East 24th Street;

THENCE, westerly with the south right of way line of East 24th Street to its point of intersection with the east right of way line of Red River Street;

THENCE, southerly with the east right of way line of Red River Street to the PLACE OF BEGINNING.

TRACT NO. TWO:

BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the east right of way line of Red River Street and the north right of way line of East 20th Street;

THENCE, easterly with the north right of way line of East 20th Street to its point of intersection with the west right of way line of Sabine Street;

THENCE, northerly with the west right of way line of Sabine Street to its point of intersection with the south right of way line of East 20-1/2 Street;

THENCE, westerly with the south right of way line of East 20-1/2 Street to its point of intersection with the east right of way line of Red River Street;

THENCE, southerly with the east right of way line of Red River Street to the PLACE OF BEGINNING.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Nichols, carried by the following vote;

Ayes: Councilman Nichols, Mayor Akin, Councilmen Janes, Long
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman LaRue

UNIVERSITY EAST URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT - URBAN RENEWAL PLAN on following page: